APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/922,190	08/02/2001	Chi-Hung Fu	SUN-P1680NP.US.NC	7614

	EXAMINER
	TRUONG, CAM Y T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2172	2

7590   08/17/2004

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP
Third Floor
Two North Market Street
San Jose, CA 95113

DATE MAILED: 08/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/922,190	FU ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Cam Y T Truong	2172

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-29* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-29* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-29 are pending in this Office Action.

Abstract

2.   Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 7 and 23 recite the limitation "the condition of said constructed element" in page 26, line 22, page 30, line 22. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 1-3, 8-12, 17-19, 24-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burkett et al (USP 6635089) in view of Shih et al (or hereinafter "Shih") (USP 6615223).

As to claims 1 and 17, Burkett teaches the claimed limitations:

"accessing a template name; reading a template according to said accessed template name" as when an XML parser processes an XML file, it reads the file and constructs a DOM tree based on the syntax of tags embedded in the file and the interrelationships between those tags. The tag syntax is stored in the nodes of the DOM tree. The above information implies that when the system reads the XML file, the system has to read the XML file's name. XML file is represented as template. XML file's name is represented as a template name, (col. 2, lines 44-50),

"said template comprising structural information of said directory information tree" as XML notation is one form in which information may be stored within a directory. XML notation or form, which contains tags, can be represented as structure information. The directory is represented as the directory information tree (col. 3, lines 1-3; col. 8, lines 35-40);

"constructing an entry comprising: said received first set of attributes; a destination location within said directory information, said destination location generated using said structural information" as constructing an entry in database

X.500 or LDAP directory including a set of attributes such as RDNs of CN = John

A. Smith, OU= Userinterface, OU = PanelOne, the directory entry is located

using the Relative Distinguished Name RDN, the RDN is generated using tags of

XML files (col. 10, lines 10-45).

Burkett does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation

"receiving a first set of attributes from an application program, said

received first set of attributes not including a location within said directory

information tree; adding said constructed entry to said directory information tree

at said destination location".

Shih teaches that if a client at replication site 302 wishes to add a new

LDAP directory entry to the DIT 20 of fig. 5. The new entry has the following

properties: entry no. = 104, last name = last, first name = Bob, tel. No.= 555-

5555, state = CA, and Manager = Jim Smith. Fig 11, depicts DIT 20 after new

entry 104 is added to the directory tree. The above information shows that the

system receives an entry including a set of attributes such as last name, first

name, telephone number, state from client site to add to the directory tree. This

set of attributes is not included in the directory tree (col. 8, lines 55-61,

figs.5&11).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to apply Shih's teaching of adding a new LDAP

directory entry from client site to the DIT 20 of fig. 5. The new entry has the

following properties: entry no. = 104, last name = last, first name = Bob, tel. No.=

555-5555, state = CA, and Manager = Jim Smith to Burkett's system in order to

maintain or update entries in a directory for future processing.

As to claims 2 and 18, Burkett teaches the claimed limitation "a second set

of attributes, said second set comprising default values for inclusion in said

constructed entry" as shown in fig. 4G which shows the corresponding nodes

447, 448, 450 as children of the default-values node 445 for a entry in a DOM

tree (col. 12, lines 20-45).

As to claims 3 and 19, Burkett teaches the claimed limitation "wherein said

template further comprises a third set of attributes, said third set comprising

attributes that are required to have assigned values" as Label 447, textfield 448,

textfield 449, pushbutton 450 are represented as a third set of attributes that are

required to have assigned values (fig. 4G; col. 12, lines 35-45).

As to claims 9, 12, 25 and 28, Burkett teaches the claimed limitation

"wherein said directory information tree is an LDAP directory" as LDAP (col. 4,

lines 10-15).

As to claims 10 and 26, Burkett teaches the claimed limitation:

"passing a template name to an application program interface" as when an

XML parser processes an XML file, it reads the file and constructs a DOM tree

based on the syntax of tags embedded in the file and the interrelationships

between those tags. The tag syntax is stored in the nodes of the DOM tree. The above information implies that the system has included an application program interface for reading the XML file. Thus, when reading the XML file, the system has to pass the XML file's name to an application program interface. XML file is represented as template. XML file's name is represented as a template name, (col. 2, lines 44-50),

"said template comprising structural information of said directory information tree" as XML notation is one form in which information may be stored within a directory. Notation of XML or form can be represented as structure information. The directory is represented as the directory information tree (col. 3, lines 1-3).

Burkett does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "passing information for said entry to said application program interface, said passed information not including a location for said entry within said directory information tree".

Shih teaches that if a client at replication site 302 wishes to add a new LDAP directory entry to the DIT 20 of fig. 5. The new entry has the following properties: entry no. = 104, last name = last, first name = Bob, tel. No.= 555-5555, state = CA, and Manager = Jim Smith. Fig 11, depicts DIT 20 after new entry 104 is added to the directory tree. The above information shows that the system has included an application program interface to pass new entry for adding the new entry to the directory tree. This new entry is not included in the directory tree before (col. 8, lines 55-61, figs.5&11).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Shih's teaching of adding a new LDAP directory entry from client site to the DIT 20 of fig. 5. The new entry has the following properties: entry no. = 104, last name = last, first name = Bob, tel. No.= 555-5555, state = CA, and Manager = Jim Smith to Burkett's system in order to maintain or update entries in a directory for future processing.

As to claims 8, 11, 24 and 27, Burkett teaches the claimed limitation "wherein said template is an XML file" as an XML file (col. 2, lines 44-50).

6.   Claims 4 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burkett et al (USP 6635089) in view of Shih et al (or hereinafter "Shih") (USP 6615223) and further in view of Lee et al (or hereinafter "Lee") (USP 6480865).

As to claims 4 and 20, Burkett and Shih disclose the claimed limitation subject matter in claims 1 and 17, except the claimed limitation "wherein said template further comprises information specifying a verification program for verifying one or more attributes of said first set of attributes". However, Lee teaches that uses XML for a particular specification, there would be a DTD that specifies the XML schema and one or more XML documents that satisfy that scheme. A valid XML document is one that satisfies the restrictions of its associated DTD schema. However, it is expensive to verify the XML document

against the DTD schema. The above information shows that XML has include

DTD schema specifying a verification program to verify an attribute ID of a

document. DTD schema of XML is represented as a template (col. 3, lines 5-45).

. It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to apply Lee's teaching of using DTD of a XML to

specify XML schema and XML document or verifying XML document to make

sure it satisfies the restrictions of its associated DTD schema to Burkett's system

and Shih's system in order to store a document in correct format.

7.   Claims 5-7, 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Burkett et al (USP 6635089) in view of Shih et al (or

hereinafter "Shih") (USP 6615223) and further in view of Ambrosini et al (or

hereinafter "Ambrosini") (USP 6609121).

As to claims 5 and 21, Burkett teaches the claimed limitations:

"a second set of attributes, said second set comprising default values for

inclusion in said constructed entry" as default-values node 445 is shown in the

DOM tree 437 that corresponding to document 426 which is stored in the

directory entry. The default-values node 445 is represented as a second set of

attributes (col. 10, lines 40-45; col. 12, lines 35-45);

"a third set of attributes, said third set comprising attributes that are

required to have assigned values" as Label 447, textfield 448, textfield 449,

pushbutton 450 are represented as a third set of attributes that are required to have assigned values (fig. 4G; col. 12, lines 35-45).

Burkett and Shih do not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "information specifying a program for verifying one or more attributes of said first set of attributes". However, Ambrosini teaches that a plug-in function can valid data before a new entry is added to the directory. If the data is invalid, the plug-in function can abort the LDAP add operation and return an error message to the LDAP client. This information indicates the system has included a verify program for verifying data (col. 6, lines 44-47).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Ambrosini's teaching of validating new entry before adding to the directory. If the new entry is invalid, the adding new entry is unacceptable to the directory to Burkett's system and Shih's system in order to avoid storing duplicated data or prevent conflicting during updating entries in a directory.

As to claims 6, 22, Burkett teaches the claimed limitation "wherein said template is an XML file" as an XML file (col. 2, lines 44-50).

As to claims 7, 23, Burkett and Shih disclose the claimed limitation subject matter in claims 1 and 17, except the claimed limitation "the step of detecting the condition of said constructed element being unacceptable for addition to said directory information tree". Ambrosini teaches that a plug-in function can valid

data before a new entry is added to the directory. If the data is invalid, the plug-in function can abort the LDAP add operation and return an error message to the LDAP client. This information indicates the system detects the condition if the data is invalid, the adding new entry is unacceptable to the directory (col. 6, lines 44-47).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Ambrosini's teaching of validating new entry before adding to the directory. If the new entry is invalid, the adding new entry is unacceptable to the directory to Burkett's system and Shih's system in order to prevent conflicting during updating entries in a directory.

8.   Claims 13, 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burkett et al (USP 6635089).

As to claim 13, Burkett teaches the claimed limitation:

"accessing a template name; reading a template according to said accessed template name" as when an XML parser processes an XML file, it reads the file and constructs a DOM tree based on the syntax of tags embedded in the file and the interrelationships between those tags. The tag syntax is stored in the nodes of the DOM tree. The above information implies that when the system reads the XML file, the system has to read the XML file's name. This XML file contains syntax of tags of LDAP directory. XML file is represented as

template. XML file's name is represented as a template name, (col. 2, lines 44-50),

" said template comprising: structural information of said directory information tree" as XML notation is one form in which information may be stored within a directory. Information of XML notation or form can be represented as structure information. The directory is represented as the directory information tree (col. 3, lines 1-3);

"a first set of attributes" as attributes <CN>, <OU>, and <return attribute> are represented as a first set of attributes for a user interface or template 626 (fig. 6B);

"performing a query operation using said query object" as (col. 18, lines 5-40).

"accessing a second set of attributes from an application program, said accessed second set not included in said first set" as accessing default values attributes 445 which contains label, text filed, pushbutton, is represented as a second set of attributes not included in the first set CN, OU, Return attribute (fig. 4G) ;

Burkett does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "constructing a query object comprising: said first set of attributes, said second set of attributes". However, Burkett teaches node 441 contains a first set of attributes 442, 443, 444 and node 445 contains a set second set of attributes 447, 448, 449, 450. Nodes 441 and 445 are considered the childs of the node query 440. These

nodes are used to specify the query 440 for document 426. Query document 426 is represented as a query object (fig. 4G, col. 34-44).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Burkett's teaching of using a first set of attributes 442, 443, 444 and second set of attributes 447-450 to specify query 440 for document 426 in order to retrieve documents or update document from a directory tree easily.

As to claim 15, Burkett teaches the claimed limitation "wherein said template is an XML file" as an XML file (col. 2, lines 44-50).

As to claim 16, Burkett teaches the claimed limitation "wherein said directory information tree is an LDAP directory" as LDAP (col. 4, lines 10-15).

9. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burkett et al (USP 6635089) in view of Lee.

As to claim 14, Burkett discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 13, except the claimed limitation "wherein said template further comprises information specifying a verification program for verifying one or more attributes of said first set of attributes". However, Lee teaches that uses XML for a particular specification, there would be a DTD that specifies the XML schema and one or more XML documents that satisfy that scheme. A valid XML document is one that satisfies the restrictions of its associated DTD schema.

However, it is expensive to verify the XML document against the DTD schema. The above information shows that XML has include DTD schema specifying a verification program to verify an attribute ID of a document. DTD schema of XML is represented as a template (col. 3, lines 5-45).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lee's teaching of using DTD of a XML to specify XML schema and XML document or verifying XML document to make sure it satisfies the restrictions of its associated DTD schema to Burkett's system in order to store a document in correct format.

Allowable Subject Matter

10.   Claim 29 is allowed.

As to claim 29, none of the available prior art of record teaches or fairly suggest "H) detecting the condition of said constructed entry being unacceptable for addition to said directory information tree; at least one said condition being the absence of a value for any attribute in said third set of attributes; I) if said constructed entry is unacceptable, generating an error condition; and J) adding said constructed entry to said directory information tree at said destination location" in specific combination as recited in claim 29

Conclusion

10.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

Lection et al (USP 6418446)

Contact Information

11.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from

the examiner should be directed to Cam-Y Truong whose telephone number is

(703-605-1169). The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from

8:00AM to 4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the

examiner's supervisor, John Breene, can be reached on (703-305-9790). The

fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is

assigned is (703)-872-9306.   Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to

the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist

whose telephone number is (703-305-3900).

Cam-Y Truong

1/7/03

                                                JOHN BREENE
                                    SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
                                        TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100